



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of any other viewpoint. If the world is throughout *caused*, then for him there can be nowhere any *purpose* in it. He assumes without inquiry the complete incompatibility of cause and purpose in the same universe; just as he assumes without inquiry the complete incompatibility of the subjectivity and objectivity of space and time, as constituents of the world we know.

Had he been a little less impatient with all idealism, and a little more disposed to give the matter patient consideration, he might perhaps have seen that space and time not only *may be*, but *must be*, both subjective and objective at the same time. And had he been a little less impatient with all theology, and a little more disposed to metaphysical thinking, he might have seen that cause and purpose, force and idea, are but two aspects of the same whole, and that neither can be spared from our thinking without an impoverishment of our universe.

And then perhaps, having seen this great truth, Mr. Spencer would have been disposed to reconsider an ethical doctrine which, as it stands, fails utterly to explain why man should ever conceive a higher or better state, and lay upon his own conscience the solemn obligation of striving to attain unto it. He would reconsider a sociology which, talking constantly of "progress," leaves that important word entirely devoid of those teleological implications which alone can give it intelligible significance. And he would reconsider a philosophy of religion which, in so far as it remains consistent with itself, removes God so far from the reach of man, and so denudes him of all knowable qualities, as to leave the religious nature (which Spencer declares to be as genuine as any other faculty of man's being) without any proper conceivable "environment"—that is to say, without any proper object upon which it may bestow itself in faith and love and service, and from which it may receive that sustenance without which, according to Spencer's own doctrine, it must fall into a condition of atrophy, and finally disappear.

FREDERICK TRACY.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

HENRY WARD BEECHER.

IN this volume,¹ Dr. Lyman Abbott, out of the riches of a lifelong personal acquaintance with Mr. Beecher, presents the public with an interpretation, an "appreciation," and a defense of his great master and friend.

Such a volume is perhaps specially needed just at this time. Mr.

¹ *Henry Ward Beecher*. By LYMAN ABBOTT. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1903. xl+458 pages. \$1.75, net.

Beecher died under a cloud that had scarcely been lifted. His denominational associates to a large degree feared he had been guilty of the things with which he was charged, and let him drop from even casual mention. Others, not so immediately concerned, did not forget him or cease to speak of him and his great services. They did not so much fear because, possibly, they had not so much loved. But time is bringing, if it has not quite brought, a defense to Mr. Beecher's memory which is producing a great change. It is growing increasingly clear that he was sinned against; and the greatness of his services to religion and public life may now receive a new consideration, and his influence a new extension.

The review of his life which this book brings us shows two things with great clearness: how fully he was an exponent—so much so as to be in fact the typical exponent—of the spirit of that Congregationalism in which he was born, and which he served with the exception of the few years of his western ministry; and how, by virtue of it, he was the greatest prophet of his time. The modern Congregationalist, who reads Dr. Abbott's book and dips here and there again into Beecher's sermons, lectures, or political addresses, is struck with the modern air which pervades them, thirty or more years old though they may be, and recognizes it as the very air which he is himself breathing today. Congregationalism is essentially free, democratic, and practical. There were Congregationalists who in various ways resisted the natural outflow of one or more of these secret fountains of its power; but Mr. Beecher promoted their most liberal forthputting. The fathers of Congregationalism were not scholastics, and even their great theologians were always aiming at immediate practical effects. Beecher was often opposed for his lack of theology, scholarship, and what not; but, as Dr. Abbott shows, it was not lack of theology which characterized Mr. Beecher, but the subordination of theological form to direct effect for good. He had scholarship, but no pedantry. He had the courage, too, which belongs to the freedom of Congregationalism. Hence his modernness. He welcomed evolution, when others were depreciating it because they feared it. In his sermon upon "The Unity of Man" he granted everything to evolution which it could then (1872) ask, but insisted, whatever man's origin, upon the manifest *fact* of his unity in spiritual powers and needs. And then he said:

I look upon science as God's elect, not yet knowing her own mission. *I believe she is destined to regenerate religion herself.* I believe that science is speaking to us, and that we are to derive from it a nobler conception of God. . . . Therefore I say "All hail!" to the men who search and look after God's footprints. But while I say this, I cannot afford to say to any modern deductions:

"Take my faith, and I will give up the God of my fathers and the faith of my youth." There is nothing which I find in science that can take the place of that faith which I learned in my earlier years, and which I have lived on all my life long.

It took more than twenty years for leading evangelical theologians to come to that position, so much was Mr. Beecher ahead of his times; but that was the true attitude of Congregationalism, as it has now recognized.

Perhaps this anticipatory modernness of Mr. Beecher is nowhere better brought out than in his sermon, of the same year, upon the disclosures of municipal corruption in the days of Tweed in New York. That sermon is engaged in enforcing the idea, by some thought so new, and to many yet below the eastern horizon of their intellectual world, of the solidarity of men, and of the share of responsibility of every member of a community for the crimes that may be done in it:

It is a partnership. There is some of your blood and some of mine in every one of those thieving rascals. We are their fathers. . . . We breed felons when we permit, or in minor matters set on foot, those causes which issue in the production of laxness in public or commercial life. . . . *You* must cure it. A part of the cure lies in your heart; a part of it in your family; a part of it in the common schools; etc.

It was characteristic of Beecher to preach upon such themes. He counted "nothing human foreign to him" or to his pulpit. Dr. Abbott does well, therefore, to emphasize what many did not know at the time, or have since forgotten, that public topics did not constitute the burden and bulk of his ministry. His great object was the conversion of men. He did not even lay the chief emphasis upon edifying men, as many a preacher has who has thought himself eminently evangelical. The unconverted man, the outsider, was chief in Beecher's mind, and the great majority of his sermons were directed to gaining the attention of this class and furnishing them with the motives which should lead to repentance and salvation. If he was not conventional in this, and if he seemed often to go far afield to bring the motives of the gospel to bear upon men, it was doubtless because he saw, or thought he saw, peculiar difficulties in men's way needing removal in just that method.

So, in his reformatory work, his interpreter has done us a great service in bringing out so clearly the sane, conservative, broad, and wise elements of Mr. Beecher's methods and work. We were in danger of forgetting these, as some were so shocked by the unusual about Mr. Beecher that they could never perceive them. He auctioneered a slave off in his church to secure the funds for her purchase and liberation. This was sensational,

and to many so confounding that they thought Mr. Beecher a fanatic and extremist. But decidedly as he used his great opportunity in the *Independent*, of which he was an editor, he advocated nothing harsh or rash. He did not expect or encourage war. But he would not support the Fugitive Slave Law. "Obedience to laws, even though they sin against me; disobedience to every law that commands me to sin," was his principle. He maintained a spirit of Christian kindness toward slaveholder as well as toward slave. And it would have been his choice if the whole work of uprooting and destroying slavery had been left to the slower but irresistible influences of Christianity upon public sentiment. This was not the spirit of excess, but the wisdom of an exceptionally great and pure mind.

To the public at large Beecher's greatest single service will be thought, no doubt, to be his defense of America before the English nation in 1863. There is something so picturesque about the whole campaign, the power of the man comes out so clearly, his pluck is so admirable, and the contagion of his enthusiasm is so great, that no American—and, for that matter, no Englishman—can read the story without feeling not only astonishment at the feat, but gratitude to the man. Whether the ruling classes would have let England drift into acknowledgment of the Confederacy after Vicksburg and Gettysburg or not, Beecher won the great working classes, and made such an acknowledgment forever impossible. Considered as oratorical efforts, Dr. Abbott is not extreme when he claims for these addresses a place beside those of Demosthenes, Cicero, Fox, and Burke. For forensic success they are unsurpassed in the history of oratory.

But Mr. Beecher was a minister of the gospel; and, whatever his influence elsewhere may have been, the most important question which can be asked about him is: What was his influence within the legitimate sphere of his chosen calling? And here, next to his practical success as a winner of souls, his success as a leader in theological thinking comes under necessary examination. It is probable that he had more direct influence in modeling the thought of the country at large than any professor of theology who could be mentioned. What was the character of that influence, and how likely is it to endure?

The answer to these questions seems now tolerably clear. Mr. Beecher rendered little or no service to scientific, systematic theology. He did not design to. He selected the doctrines which he wished to emphasize, because they were fundamental for conviction, conversion, for development of faith, for dominant love of Christ, for character. Thus he looked at the whole problem of theology from a different angle from that occupied by the scientific theologian. But all the more for that, he vivified what

he did teach. The results of this are evident in Dr. Abbott. Most of those things which he thinks he received from Mr. Beecher he had probably heard in his veriest youth in his New England home, for they were the commonplaces of New England theology, and Beecher had absorbed them from his father in Litchfield and Boston, long before he studied them with him in Cincinnati. But they were dead, inoperative, misconstrued, and overlaid in the mind of the eager youth who took his place one day in Plymouth Church and got a new and dazzling vision of the great love of God. Beecher had made them live. And this he did for thousands of others all over the land.

The earliest teaching of Mr. Beecher seems to have been just the New School theology of New England in the main. In the main—for doubtless he differed at this or that unimportant point. By and by he got interested in evolution, and both he and Dr. Abbott have attempted to state theology in terms of evolution. Neither of those efforts seems to have any great promise of permanence. They do not understand evolution altogether. Who does, as yet? They are interesting, and no doubt of distinct value as efforts. But no one, not even their authors probably, expected that they would achieve permanence as authoritative statements of truth. Yet their value has been very great, and if they had had no other value whatever, the value of the fact that their authors were not afraid of evolution, while still standing, to their own apprehension, within the fellowship of the Christian church and the circle of evangelical theology, was and is immeasurably great.

It was in connection with criticisms made upon Mr. Beecher for his sermons upon evolution that he determined in 1882 to withdraw from the New York and Brooklyn Association of Congregational Ministers. He made at the time an elaborate statement of his theological position. At its close the association voted unanimously, among other things, that "his full and proffered exposition of doctrinal views that he has made at this meeting indicates the propriety of his continued membership in this or any other Congregational association." A review at this date of the statement confirms this judgment. It was not "systematic," as many count system; it did not accord with Calvinism of any variety at every point; but it was, substantially theistic, Trinitarian, kenotic in its Christology, and cordially accepted providence, prayer, miracles, regeneration by the Holy Spirit, inspiration (quoting freely from the Westminster Confession), atonement, and future punishment (though not affirming its endlessness). In fact, by some Congregationalists at the present day it would be called conservative. But throughout it illustrated what has been already said, that Beecher's

theological interest was with the doctrines that immediately and powerfully affect men, with the practical rather than the scholastic, and that his power was in making simple and fundamental doctrines live and effect revolutionary changes in men's souls. In all this he was pre-eminently the child of that New England theology of which his father, Lyman Beecher, had been one of the leading exponents and defenders.

The true greatness of Beecher was therefore the greatness of a great personality; and his true work in the world, that of bringing to bear personal power for the moving of men toward righteousness and toward God. In this respect he did a work equalled by none of his contemporaries in this country, and remotely approached by but few. When so much has been said, has it not been said that he gained and maintained a place among the greatest men of our nation and our time?

FRANK HUGH FOSTER.

THE PARSONAGE, OLIVET, MICH.

THE TALMUD AND CHRISTIANITY.¹

THE extension of the historico-religious method to the study of the New Testament has made it necessary that the ideas and aspirations of the contemporary Judaism should be very closely scrutinized. And the New Testament itself, with its Jewish coloring, tempered though it is by a strong and avowed polemic against official Judaism, not only suggests, but demands, this investigation in the interests of its own understanding and interpretation. Responding to this demand, recent years have witnessed the appearance of many works dealing with the history of the Jewish religion in New Testament times. And one of the most striking characteristics of this movement is that the sources of information with regard to contemporary Judaism have been found largely in the apocalyptic Jewish literature which has been preserved chiefly in the Christian church among the apocryphal and pseudepigraphal books. This has been done intentionally, and with the avowed conviction that it is from the literature of the people, the uncultivated masses, that one can gain the most vivid conception of the real force of a religion and of religious ideas.² Proceeding on

¹*Talmud und Theologie*. Ein Vortrag von PAUL FIEBIG. Tübingen und Leipzig: Mohr, 1903. viii + 30 pages.

Introduction to the Talmud. By M. MIELZINER. Second revised edition. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1903. 297 pages. \$2, net.

Christianity in Talmud and Midrash. By R. TRAVERS HERFORD. London: Williams & Norgate, 1903. xvi + 449 pages.

²See article by BOUSSET, "Die Religionsgeschichte und das Neue Testament," *Theologische Rundschau*, July, 1904, p. 271.